



EMORY herald trib

no. 10

A hunk of editorial with which I agree:

"There is no contradiction between support for the aspirations of the poor people of the world and a longing for peace. The poor want bread and shelter and they will periodically die struggling for these needs until they are finally met. The absence of struggle and violence under conditions of poverty and oppression simply cannot lead to peace. Peace is possible only under conditions of self-determination and cooperation. The existing Third World conditions of poverty and oppression constitute a state of violence to human beings, enforced with violence or threats of violence.

"To demand "peace" in Vietnam, without elaborating precisely what is meant by peace, is to ignore the status quo of violence enforcing poverty and oppression. To demand "negotiations" in Vietnam is to advocate the negotiation of violence inflicted on the poor. The interests of the poor who happen to live in a tiny slice of Asia dictate that capitalist imperialism be defeated in Vietnam because that is the only way in which peace will ever be attained. It is the only way in which the violence of poverty and oppression can be banished.

"The demand for immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam is the anti-Vietnam war movement's only significant political demand. All else is commentary or evasion...." (National Guardian editorial, October 21, 1967, p. 2.)

Tom Coffin (Box 21140. Welcome contributions, whether green or black & white.)
11/16/67

THE PEACEFUL SNATCH -- by Steve Abbott

Problems of campus Pro-Vietnam backers are surprisingly similar to problems of us peace people. Mike Harrington's Pro group has been embarrassed, perhaps weakened, by the literature and ideology of YAF (the speech and thought patterns of some right-wingers being more in the next with the Hell's Angels than Hitler even). Likewise, Emory Community Peace Union consists of a wide diversity of opinion: from the respectable, reasoned caution of Rev. Lon Chesnut to Greeks and central elements to "far out" folks whose freaky logic would bounce better off rubber walls at the Funny Farm. Who is what, of course, depends on your point of view. If radicals see me as a cowardly, petty bourgeoisie square, Emory moderates (?) see me as a two-horned Commie Utopian (actually I'm just an iridescent chimera and reports of my existence have been greatly exxxaggerated). In the midst of all this confusing diversity, here are 3 helpful rules:

- 1) DON'T ASK OR EXPECT THE VIETNAM QUES. TO SPLIT "SIMPLY" INTO PRO AND CON. Many peace people who object to certain CIA activities don't object to the CIA itself. Again, some Vietnam backers don't like the present Draft system.
- 2) DON'T JUDGE AN ENTIRE POSITION BY ONE OR A FEW PROPONENTS. TAKE EACH POSITION ON THE BASIS OF ITS BEST ARGUMENTS AND BEST PROPONENTS. I was recently chagrined to hear peace people publicly vilify Mendel Rivers as a person. That's not the issue -- indeed it blurs the issues. I would disagree with Mendel even if he had all the virtues of Christ and Carrie Nation rolled into one. Emotionalism and Ad hominem fallacies weaken whatever good arguments one may have.
- 3) BE SERIOUS ABOUT THESE SERIOUS ISSUES but let's keep a sense of humor about ourselves.

high: "Whatdawe folks know gainst the word o' the experts. Them people in Washington's got our best interests at heart (stage directions: violin senario begins)" Happily the Dec. issue of Esquire mag. comes to the rescue in the article "Big Brass Lambs".

Says General David M. Shoup (Kennedy's favorite Marine): "I believe that if we had and would keep our dirty, bloody, dollar-crooked fingers out of the business of these nations so full of depressed, exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own." Shoup also believes the danger of internatl. communism has been vastly oversold to Americans as a threat to capitalism.

Says Rear Admiral Arnold E. True: "I see no strategic or other reason for maintaining a base in Vietnam....Our anti-Communist adventures bring us no return...." Says Brigadier General Hugh B. Hester: "I agree with U Thant that this is a war of national independence not a case of Communist aggression. I think we ought to get out the same way we got in -- unilaterally."

The list of authorities and experts against our Vietnam policy goes on, and on, and on, and on, and on, and on....just like the war.

Attachment E

EMORY COMMUNITY PEACE UNION reports on CIA

According to the U.S. Constitution only Congress and the president are charged with making foreign policy. Time and time again, however, Congress, the President, and the American public has been shocked and embarrassed by CIA activities. Fred Cook wrote in The Nation (June 24, 1961) that the CIA is a "two-headed monster"; it is not only a cloak-and-dagger agency to collect intelligence, it also "has the authority to act on its own information." Wise and Ross write (The Invisible Government, NY, 1964) that there are two governments in the United States, one visible, the other invisible; one children study about, the other a global empire for espionage and for making decisions in secrecy affecting war and peace.

AS STUDENTS WE ARE ESPECIALLY CONCERNED about the CIA infiltration of NSA (National Student Assoc. of which Emory is a member) and of university projects and faculty organizations, but before we present the facts, realize our charges are not "radical" but merely echoing charges made by Presidents Eisenhower and Truman.

Said DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER in his last speech as President Jan. 17, 1961: "In the councils of government we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will continue to persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted...."

HARRY S. TRUMAN, who instituted the CIA in 1947, wrote in a syndicated article for the North American Newspaper Alliance (Dec. 12, 1963) that he "would like the CIA to be restored to its original assignment as an intelligence arm of the President and whatever else it can properly perform in that special field. There is something about the way the CIA is functioning that is casting a shadow over our historic position and I feel that we need to correct it."

After Michigan State University, along with other institutions, were disclosed as having contracted for certain CIA projects (MSU's was in Vietnam) twelve MSU anthropology profs wrote a letter to the New York Times (May 29, 1966) saying: "Our professional interests as anthropologists require us, like our colleagues at other universities, to spend a good deal of time carrying out basic field research in the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is unfortunate that on occasion, some of our field research is jeopardized because anthropologists overseas generally work under the handicap of being suspected of CIA associations. Given this general handicap, our position is now rendered doubly difficult because the university with which we are affiliated has itself become suspect."

On Nov. 17, 1966, at the Anthropological Assoc. Convention heard its former pres., Dr. R.A. Beals charge that scholars are offered large sums to serve as intelligence agents abroad and that some CIA agents were posing as anthropologists. He cited several cases what universities or the State Dept. had to cancel projects when the connection was exposed. Following Dr. Beals report, the convention protested CIA intrusion in the work of scientists. Sociologists, likewise, were shocked and smeared when Project Camelot was exposed. (See Emory Wheel November 16, for details). The NSA scandal is too well known to need further discussion. These are just some reasons why WE object to CIA presence recruiting on campus. WHAT IS YOUR POSITION ?????

THE EMORY COMMUNITY PEACE UNION

The CIA and American Foreign-policy Sabotage

The CIA was originated by President Harry Truman to be, in his words, "The intelligence arm of the President." The scope of the CIA has however expanded far beyond this narrowly-defined intention to the point at which it is not only an information-gathering service, but also a policy-forming institution.

Hence as early as Dec. 22, 1963 former President Truman was quoted by the Washington Post: "For some time I have been disturbed the way CIA has been diverted from its original assignment. It has become an operational arm and at times a policy-making arm of the Government"

It is obvious that a state which wishes to be democratic cannot allow its foreign policy to be formulated by its secret service. This however is precisely the situation the CIA. To quote Sen. Eugene McCarthy in the Jan. 4-11 Sat. Eyn. Post: "Wrapped in its cloak of secrecy, the CIA modestly hints it has overthrown foreign governments, admits it violates international law and doesn't deny that one of its exploits wrecked a summit conference. The CIA, in short, is making foreign policy and, in so doing, is assuming roles of the President and the Congress. It has taken on the character of an invisible government answering only to itself..."

And going beyond the mere formulation of policy, there are dramatic instances in which the CIA has caused great humiliation of the State Dept. and the Nation-- often resulting in the alteration or subversion of previous National policy. In such a way policy is effectively sabotaged.

One such instance is that of the notorious U-2 flight of May 1, 1960. The Eisenhower-Khrushchev Summit Conference was scheduled for the 16th of May. Both the President and the State Dept. knew that the spy flight was to take place. Attempts of the US to lie and cover up the facts were effortlessly exposed by the Soviets, and the Summit Conference became a spectacular Russian propaganda victory, for as in The U-2 Affair by Ross and W. "The government of the US had lied, admitted it had lied, denied Presidential responsibility then admitted it, threatened, for all practical purposes to continue the spy flights, then suspended them. The Summit Meeting had blown sky-high."

But now the real question is: How in the face of the imminent Summit Conference did the spy flight come to take place? According to Wise and Ross the intelligence community feared that the Summit Conference would produce an understanding between the cold war parties on reducing tensions--possibly entailing the grounding of the U-2 flights. And hence the CIA intentionally staged the flight which wrecked the Summit Conference. And to quote from Blackstock: The Strategy of Subversion, "Harold Stassen, former disarmament adviser charged that 'some of our military officers' had deliberately scheduled the flight knowing 'full well the reaction and counter-reaction which such flights cause, and the adverse effects on the chances for progress in the negotiations at the Summit.' Thus the CIA had sabotaged the interests of the American and Russian people in order to its sacred spy flights."

Another case in point is the "Bay of Pigs" invasion of Cuba. Although President K had explicitly informed the CIA and all others concerned that there was to be absolutely no direct US military intervention. The CIA nevertheless badgered the State Dept. for a change of policy to the point where the State Dept. had to insist that the policy was to And even then the CIA continued to lay plans for the invasion under the assumption that US air power would be forthcoming when the chips were down, planning the invasion in such a way that it could end only in disaster without strong US support in the air. The confidence that the CIA had in the ultimate subversion of Kennedy's policy is reflected the fact that the carriers Essex and Boxer were standing by to help, even though there were Presidential orders that there was to be no such help. When, consequently, the invasion was near annihilation the President reluctantly reversed himself and allowed jets to fly cover for a bombing raid. Thus the CIA had again subverted and sabotaged US foreign policy.

The CIA is guilty of putting its own institutional interest above that of the American people. It is guilty of sabotage of our foreign policy when such policy does not agree with its own.

We live in a world in which international tensions are so brittle that a small surprise spark can set off the nuclear destruction of civilization. Clearly in such a world there is no place for the CIA.

The "Real Issues In Counter-Recruitment Demonstrations

The EMORY AD HOC COMMITTEE is quite alarmed by the recent attempts of the Emory dissenters to our commitment in Viet Nam to deny certain organizations the right to recruit on campus. We feel that this is nothing less than a subtle attack upon our right to disagree with the dissenters.

Here are what we see as the real issues involved in counter-recruitment demonstrations:

First, the Emory dissenters apparently are so convinced of the rightness of their cause that they are willing to use almost any means for their end. Quoting from a recent SSOC petition posted on campus: "America's continued presence in Viet Nam compels those who oppose the war to act effectively to bring the war to an end Considering the urgency of fighting against the war, arguments against the tactics of demonstrations seem to pale."

So first, the EMORY AD HOC COMMITTEE understands the Emory dissenters' attacks upon groups like Dow Chemical and the CIA as a means for their end, their fight against the Viet Nam commitment.

Second, these demonstrations against the right of certain groups to organize on campus amount to this: The Emory dissenters are against our freedom to disagree with them and to act according to our own beliefs. For instance, there are many of us who feel that a strong military is essential for a strong America and that the CIA is not a "criminal" organization but a necessity. But according to the Emory dissenters, we should not have the right to talk to these people, to join with them in their effort.

Make no mistake; the Emory dissenters are moving against anyone and everyone who supports the U.S. commitment to Viet Nam and tries to act in accord with this commitment. With respect to the recruiter issue, we quote once again from a recent SSOC petition: "The central purpose of action against recruiters is to oppose them as a part and symbol of the war machine and to oppose Emory's invitation to them to use our facilities for recruitment."

The EMORY AD HOC COMMITTEE categorically supports the right of the dissenters to disseminate their views in an orderly and legal manner. We are shocked and disturbed to find that the Emory dissenters are so narrow-minded that they would try to deny our rights to voice our support of the Viet Nam commitment and to join up with groups who do support this commitment.

After all these years of trying to make Emory a place safe for academic freedoms, the Emory dissenters, ironically enough, are now trying to silence the right to disagree with them.

So, the heart of the problem is this: The Emory dissenters seem interested above all, neither in dialogue nor in free and open discussion, but in bringing to a halt the American commitment to Viet Nam. And they are going to try to deny access to any group which is an active part of this commitment.

The EMORY AD HOC COMMITTEE sees a fundamental question emerging from the chaos of the dissenters' policies: how far may dissent go without endangering or wrecking the very system in which it exists? Are the dissenters justified in using any or all of these recent moves against the war? Is the Viet Nam issue so important for the dissenters that they are willing to restrict our right to disagree with them in order to bring about their own triumph?

These questions deserve important consideration. In the coming weeks this committee will try to present the relevant issues involved. For now, our position is best described by a statement paraphrased from remarks made by Nathan Pusey, President of Harvard University:

We support the right of Emory students to express their views on all matters and to demonstrate in an orderly fashion. But they must not become so carried